

To: Nelson, Eric[nelson.ericp@epa.gov]; Houlihan, Damien[houlihan.damien@epa.gov]
Cc: Stein, Mark[Stein.Mark@epa.gov]
From: King, John Paul
Sent: Mon 11/4/2013 7:46:52 PM
Subject: RE: Bow has two additional 20 MW generators?

I believe I did refer to these peaking units in the Fact Sheet. As Damien described, they do not have a thermal discharge.

From: Nelson, Eric
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 8:28 AM
To: Houlihan, Damien; King, John Paul
Cc: Stein, Mark
Subject: RE: Bow has two additional 20 MW generators?

Ok. Good. Still, I'm surprised they hadn't been discussed before.

Thanks.


From: Houlihan, Damien
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 8:26 AM
To: Nelson, Eric; King, John Paul
Cc: Stein, Mark
Subject: RE: Bow has two additional 20 MW generators?

I'm not 100% sure about these, but I assume they do not significantly affect the thermal discharge. They don't use steam, so there's no need for cooling water. They may use a small amount for service.

Damien

From: Nelson, Eric
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 8:21 AM
To: King, John Paul; Houlihan, Damien
Cc: Stein, Mark
Subject: Bow has two additional 20 MW generators?

This op ed piece says that Bow used two additional 20 MW generators this summer. I don't recall ever hearing about them. Do we know how they affect the thermal discharge?

News Headline: My Turn: New Hampshire still needs Bow power plant | 

Outlet Full Name: Concord Monitor - Online

News Text: Regarding Ian Blackman's call to close down Merrimack and Schiller Stations ("First, shut down coal plants," Monitor Forum, Oct. 31): Ah, how quickly we/some forget.

It was only three months ago, during a July heat wave that every possible power generation source in New England was running, in order to meet consumer demand.

Not only was Merrimack Station in Bow providing power to New Hampshire customers, but two 20-megawatt generators at the Bow facility that are powered by expensive jet fuel were also called on to meet the near-record demand.

The fact is that Merrimack Station is absolutely needed to maintain reliable electrical service. It provides tremendous benefit to New Hampshire and does so efficiently. The installation of the state-mandated scrubber has reduced mercury and sulfur emissions by more than 90 percent. It is one of the cleanest coal power plants in the entire country. And the reality is that New Hampshire coal plants are no longer the main sources of carbon dioxide emissions. In fact, in 2012 more than 85 percent of all power plant CO2 emissions in New England were from natural gas fired plants.

Meantime, our region's power grid operator says that New England's dependence on natural gas has created "serious, immediate risks to grid reliability."

Blackman's view is shortsighted. One cannot simply wish away critical, necessary infrastructure simply because it is not used as frequently as it once was.

As we consider the shape of our energy future, New Hampshire has chosen a wise path, providing consumers with competitive options as well as a safety net of regulated generation sources as protection against price volatility and energy shortages. Despite the risks and uncertainty of today's market, consumers can be assured PSNH will always be there, providing reliable service, at a reasonable, state-approved price.

Let's not lose sight of that.

Eric P. Nelson

Ocean and Coastal Protection Unit

Unit Dive Officer

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

New England Region

5 Post Office Square, Suite 100

Mail Code OEP06-1

Boston, MA 02109-3912

Phone: 617-918-1676

email: nelson.ericp@epa.gov